Document 36, Public Comment Hearing, February 9, 2000, Jackson, WY Page 54 of 54

```
Thank you.
 1
             THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.
 2
 3
             And, Mr. Henneberry, you understand
    that, although your comments are made in a
 5
    private setting, they will be part of the public
 6
    record?
 7
             MR. DAVID HENNEBERRY: Yes, sir.
             THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.
 8
 9
             MR. DAVID HENNEBERRY: Thank you.
             THE FACILITATOR: We will be off the
    record.
12
                 (A recess was taken.)
             THE FACILITATOR: We're back on the
13
    record, people.
14
15
             I will ask that if anyone in the
    audience has -- who would like to comment orally
16
    this evening formally on the record and who has
17
18
    not commented yet would like to do so.
19
             We've given you an opportunity to
    register at the front desk, and I will report,
20
21
    for the record, that no one has so registered.
22
    If there is anyone who has not commented and
    would like to do so, this is your final
23
    opportunity to do that this evening at the
24
25
    Jackson Hole hearing.
                           99
```

Document 37, Public Comment Hearing, February 8, 2000, Pocatello, ID Page 1 of 6

EIS PROJECT - AR PF Control # DC - 37 HLW & FD UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING ON IDAHO HIGH-LEVEL WASTE AND FACILITIES DISPOSITION DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2000 IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY POND STUDENT UNION BUILDING POCATELLO, IDAHO Reported by: Kimberly Carpenter, CSR #600 EASTERN IDAHO COURT REPORTERS P. O. Box 50853 Idaho Falls, ID 83405 (208) 529-0222

Document 37, Public Comment Hearing, February 8, 2000, Pocatello, ID Page 2 of 6

```
1
                    MR. GEORGE WOOD: Thank you very much.
        2
                    My name is George Wood. I live at
          1680 North Mink Creek Road, Pocatello, Idaho,
          83204. I'm representing Coalition 21.
                    I would like to know a little bit about
           who I'm speaking to. So, I'd like a show of
           hands.
                   How many of you here actually work for
           the State, the EPA and INEEL? May a have a show
          of hands?
       10
       11
                   And those who are of just the public,
      12
          who are not?
      13
                   Well, I'm talking to the right people
          then. I didn't want to address my remarks so
          much to the public as I did to the people who are
          working for us.
                   There are several things I think are
      17
37-1
VIII.A(1) 18
          extremely necessary for an environmental impact
          statement to be effective. Number One, of course
          you want to know what the impact is going to be
          from a point of how much radiation, how much of
          this hazardous material, is going to go into our
      22
          environment.
      23
37-2 24
                   But, on the other hand, that doesn't
VIII.A(1) 25
          mean a thing unless you know what the effect of
                                 52
```

```
Document 37, Public Comment Hearing, February 8, 2000, Pocatello, ID Page 3 of 6
```

```
that radiation or that hazardous material is on
             the environment or on the people or the animals
             that are involved. And so we must consider what
            damage is it doing.
                     What damage is it doing?
                     How many people have been injured?
                     How many people -- how much property has
            been damaged by the radioactive nature and by the
             other hazardous materials, the nonradioactive
             materials, at INEEL?
                     That is certainly something that needs
        11
            to be considered.
                     How much of a change in the environment
37.3
VIII.6(8)
            does that make?
        15
                     In other words, if we have a huge impact
            on the environment or the amount of radiation
            added to the state of Idaho by the activities at
            INEEL, that is one thing. But if those
            activities and those additions at INEEL are
            trivial compared to the natural background and
            the natural amount of radiation that we have in
        21
            the state, perhaps we need to back off and look
            at the basic necessity of this whole procedure.
                     So, the Environmental Impact Statement
            should contain some of that information. For
                                    53
```

DOE/EIS-0287

Document 37, Public Comment Hearing, February 8, 2000, Pocatello, ID Page 4 of 6

```
instance, the 600,000 gallons of liquid waste
  37-4-
 VIII. C(1)
             should be compared to the amount of water in the
          3
             aquifer.
                      So, how much would that change the
          4
             aguifer or the water in the aguifer?
                      If it were all mixed directly into the
             aquifer, how much change would occur?
                     How much radioactivity would be added to
             the aquifer, if any?
        10
                      And what percentage of change would that
            be?
        11
                     What difference would it make, as far as
 37-5
             the soil is concerned, the people, the animals,
VIII.B(4)
             the crops, if we did have this sort of thing?
                     The question came up awhile ago about
        15
            how many cancer deaths, additional cancer deaths,
             are we talking about. And I -- I think the
            answer he gave was 9 per 10,000 people. And I
            believe, in just the natural scheme of things,
            about 2,100 or so out of 10,000 people get cancer
            anyhow. So, we're talking about 2,109 or maybe
            2,091 cancers per 10,000 people in this state.
            And that is a very, very iffy question.
                     So, what I would like to see added to
37-6
            the Environmental Impact Statement is the actual
VIII.A(7) 25
                                    54
```

Document 37, Public Comment Hearing, February 8, 2000, Pocatello, ID Page 5 of 6

```
effects on the people, the land, the crops, of
    the State of Idaho.
             Thank you very much.
             THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
    comments.
             We have a clarifying questions perhaps
    from --
            MR. THOMAS WICHMANN: I need a
    clarification question.
            THE FACILITATOR: Mr. Wood, would you
    yield to a question?
11
            Come back to the microphone, if you
    would. The Department of Energy might ask
13
    clarifying questions of commentors --
15
            MR. GEORGE WOOD: All right.
            THE FACILITATOR: -- just to ensure that
16
    they understand the nature of your comments so
    that they can be responded to adequately in the
18
    Final Environmental Impact Statement. And
    Mr. Wichmann has indicated he would like to ask a
21
    question of you, Mr. Wood.
22
            MR. GEORGE WOOD: All right.
23
            MR. THOMAS WICHMANN: Yes or no, did you
   read the accumulative impacts and the ground
   waters impacts section of this EIS before you
                           5.5
```

Document 37, Public Comment Hearing, February 8, 2000, Pocatello, ID Page 6 of 6

```
made your remarks, sir?
            MR. GEORGE WOOD: No.
             MR. THOMAS WICHMANN: Thank you.
            THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for your
   comments, Mr. Wood.
            I would like to remind you that you
   could file written comments -- submit written
   comments through a variety of ways. And all
    comments are reviewed and considered and analyzed
10
   by the Department of Energy and the State of
    Idaho in preparing the Final Environmental Impact
11
12
   Statement.
             So, is anyone else in the room who has
13
   not had an opportunity that would like to comment
15
   formally this evening?
16
            We'll let the record reflect that no one
   has so indicated.
17
18
            We will stand at ease, subject to call
   of the hearing officer in the event that others
19
20
   come who would like to comment. So, right now,
21
    we'll be off the record.
22
                 (A recess was taken.)
            THE FACILITATOR: We'll be back on the
23
24
   record.
25
            This is a continuation of the public
                           56
```

Document 38, Public Comment Hearing, February 22, 2000, Portland, OR Page 1 of 20 $\,$

	HLW & FD Page Page Control # DC -38
1	U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
2	IDAHO OPERATIONS OFFICES
3	
4	IDAHO HIGH-LEVEL WASTE AND
5	FACILITIES DISPOSITION
6	
7	Tuesday, February 22, 2000
8	
9	Portland, Oregon
10	
11	Doubletree Lloyd Center
12	
13	5:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.
14	
15	ORIGINAL
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	TEACH REPORTING (503) 248-1003 *** (800) 230-3302